DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 870 HE 002 922

AUTHOR Sandler, Bernice
TITLE What Constitutes Equity for Women in Higher Education?
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 7 Mar 72
NOTE 10p.; Address presented at Concurrent General Session I of the 27th National Conference on Higher Education

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; *Educational Opportunities; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Feminism; *Higher Education; Women Professors; *Womens Education; Working Women

ABSTRACT

Women and men too are becoming increasingly concerned about and aware of sex discrimination in higher education. In the past 2 years, formal charges of sex discrimination have been filed against 360 colleges and universities, none of which have been refuted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Discrimination exists in all facets of higher education. Women are not hired as professors because of the fear that they will get married, bear children, or not truly be committed to their profession. Women students are not admitted to colleges and universities because it is felt that education is wasted on women or that women do not belong in the professions. Women are even discriminated against in the textbooks where only men are portrayed as having had a hand in changing the course of history and civilizing the world. It is time for all of this to change, and it is time for men and women to work together to solve the problems that arise as women's traditional roles shift toward greater equality of opportunity. (HS)

ED 068720

CONCURRENT GENERAL SESSION I
Tuesday Morning, March 7

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

WHAT CONSTITUTES EQUITY FOR WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION?*

Bernice Sandler
Executive Associate and Director of
Project on the Status and Education of Women
Association of American Colleges
Washington, D.C.

For many of us, the words "women's liberation" evokes images of radical, man-hating, bra-burning women. My friends in the women's movement -- and many of them are married, to men -- tell me that bras were never burned, and that the more serious and important activities of the women's movement rarely get the attention of the press.

Women and men too are becoming increasingly concerned and aware about discrimination in education. How many of us know that formal charges of sex discrimination have been filed against more than 360 colleges and universities in the past two years? How many of us know that none of these charges have yet been refuted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in its subsequent investigations? Some of our finest institutions have been charged: Columbia University, Harvard University, Yale University, the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Minnesota, the University of Chicago, and the entire state university and college systems of the states of New York, New Jersey, California and Florida.

I don't want to imply that these institutions or any others that I mention today are worse than others for they are not, or that our campuses are worse than the rest of society. But certainly, of all the areas in our society that have come under criticism for its treatment of women, the most frequent target has been higher education. Perhaps because education holds out the promise of equality and equal opportunity, women are most angry. They have discovered that the promise, for them, is broken, and that the myth of equality is just that -- a myth. They were told that education is a woman's field, and they have now seen study after study, report after report, which clearly indicate that women are second-class citizens on the campus. The anger and the discontent of women are sharpest in academia.

Although women have been allowed to attend institutions of higher learning for more than a century, many institutions have still not gotten used to the idea. To some degree, most colleges can be described as a vast men's club where women are at best tolerated as foreign visitors, but never admitted as equals, for education is designed as though the only people who ever attended school were young, single and male. Women are not seen as serious students but as pleasant decorations on the campus. to lighten a young man's heart and perhaps to find a husband for herself.

On campus after campus, women have begun to examine their status as faculty, as staff and as students. They are examining virtually the entire structure of the university, evaluating institutional policies and practices for their effect on women. They have documented that sex discrimination on the campus is real and not a

HE 002 922

*Address presented at Concurrent General Session I of the 27th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education. Tuesday morning, March 7, 1972, Chicago.

a myth. Women are the newest and potentially the largest and certainly the fastest growing advocacy group in the academic community and in society at large. On many campuses they have stunned both faculty and administrators with formal accusations of discrimination, and with demands for changes in hiring practices, personnel policies, student admissions, fringe benefits, curriculum content -- all have come under fire.

The university community is puzzled, and like Freud, they ask, "What is it women really want?"

What women are asking for is equality of opportunity. Now certainly everyone agrees to that. But what does equal opportunity really mean?

It is more than asking one's colleagues if he knows a good man for the job, and then after the man is hired, saying, "Of course, I'd have been glad to hire a qualified woman if I could have found one."

It is more than saying "We want the best students we can find," and then turning away young women who are better qualified than the young men accepted.

Equal opportunity is more than saying "We believe in equal pay for equal work," and then paying a woman less because she is married and doesn't need as much, and paying another woman less because she's not married, and therefore doesn't need as much.

Equal opportunity is more than saying "We treat women fairly, the same way we treat men, but we don't want young women in our department because they get married. We don't want a married woman because she'll probably have children. We don't want a woman with young children because she can't possibly be committed. And as for the woman who waited until her children were older, she's much too old for work or study, and isn't it a pity that she's been out for so long and didn't start sooner."

No, that is not equal opportunity.

What women are asking for is to be free of the myths that are used to deny them the opportunities that are the birthright of their brothers.

For example, there is a myth that there is no discrimination on the campus, that things have been getting better for women, yet study after study, including more than a thousand pages of hearings held by Representative Edith Green, have shown that the position of women in academe has been deteriorating for years.

The percentage of women graduate students is less now than it was in 1930. The expansion of faculty in the postwar period was largely one of male expansion; the proportion of women faculty has dropped continuously over the past 100 years, from a third of the positions in 1870, to less than a fourth today. Many institutions have a lower proportion of women faculty NOW than they did in 1930. even worse, at least one prestigious mid-western university has a lower proportion of women on its faculty now than it did in 1899.

Women are far more likely to be hired for the lower-paying, less well-known institutions. When they are hired, they are likely to be promoted far more slowly than men. The higher the rank, the fewer the women. Study after study has documented the fact that women with the same qualifications as men are hired less frequently, at lower ranks, promoted more slowly, and receive less pay than their male colleagues. Ninety percent of the men with doctorates and 20 years of academic experience will be full professors; for women with the identical qualifications, barely half will be at that rank.

I could go on and cite the statistics that tell of careers that have been stunted, and lives that have been damaged, for sex discrimination is not a myth.

I could tell you of women who have been temporary employees, without fringe benefits or chance of promotion, for more than 10 years.

I could tell you of women who have been assistant professors for more than 20 years, of women who earn as little as half of what their male colleagues earn, and yes, even of women who have worked for years with no pay at all. I can tell you of women students who are told that what their department is looking for is "bright young men." I can tell you of students who entered undergraduate work with hopes of becoming a physician and who settled for medical technician, of others who wanted to become scientists but teach high school science instead, because professors tell them that these are not suitable fields for women. I can tell you of professors who still feel that "women shouldn't be professionals," and who believe that education is wasted on women, despite the fact that the more education a woman has the more likely she is to work, and despite the fact that 91% of the women with doctorates work.[1]

I could tell you of the myth of the shortage of "qualified women." Of course if there were no discrimination in admissions there would be more women on the campus. But still, on too many campuses, women are not hired in any number approaching the actual number of doctorates awarded to women.

Let me give you an example. In psychology, women receive 23% of all doctorates; that is about the same percentage of women listed as psychologists in the National Register of Scientific and Technological Personnel. In 1970-71 at Rutgers, the percentage of women faculty was 9%; at the University of Maryland, 6%; at the University of Wisconsin, 3%; at Columbia University, ZERO percent, despite the fact that Columbia awarded about 36% of its doctorates in psychology to women.[2] These are fairly typical figures; these institutions are no worse than any others. At one well-known California institution, the two women hired this year were the first females hired for the faculty of the psychology department since 1924. The problem is not limited to psychology or to the institutions named. It is a pattern that is found in institution after institution, in department after department.

And I can tell you of letters that say "Your qualifications are excellent, among the best we have seen. But frankly, we're looking for a man for this position. I hope you won't consider that discrimination."

Let me merely add that sex discrimination on the campus is not a myth but it is real, and it hurts women just as racial discrimination hurts minorities.

Sex discrimination is the last socially acceptable prejudice. It is so ingrained in our society that many who practice it are simply unaware that they are hurting women. Much of it is unconscious and not deliberate, but that does not make it hurt any the less. Many of the most ardent supporters for civil rights of

---

[1]81% of women doctorates in one study worked full time; 79% had not interrupted their careers in the ten years after they got their doctorate. Should the reader think that 91% is not a respectable figure, let me point out that only 81% of all men work, and of men with doctorates, only 69% work in their original field of study.

[2]The more prestigious and better known the institution, the worse the status of women. Women are far more likely to end up at the lesser known institutions and in community colleges where they constitute about 40% of the faculty, and where the opportunity for research and professional advancement are less, and where the salaries are lower.

blacks, Indians, Spanish-speaking Americans and other minorities do not view sex discrimination as "real" discrimination. They fail to notice that half of each minority group are women. I am reminded of a program for disadvantaged students which provided a transitional year at one of our major universities. All 30 of the disadvantaged students turned out to be male. Too often helping minorities has meant helping minority males only, and helping women has meant white women only. It helps minority women little to say that the reason we keep them out of a program is not because of the color of their skin, but only because of the shape of their skin.

Such discrimination against half of our citizens is wasteful and shameful, but it is all legal. There are no federal laws which forbid such discrimination. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forbids sex discrimination in employment, exempts faculty in educational institutions. Title VI of the same Act forbids discrimination in federally assisted programs, but it only applies to race, color and national origin, not sex. The Equal Pay Act excludes professional, executive and administrative employees. Even the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights has no jurisdiction over sex discrimination; it is limited by law to matters pertaining to race, color, religion and national origin, but not sex.

The only remedy that women have is the Executive Order which forbids federal contractors from discriminating in employment. It does not cover institutions which have no federal contracts, nor does it cover discrimination against students. It is an administrative remedy at best, and does not have the status of law. Moreover, its enforcement by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been the subject of bitter criticism by women's groups and the university world. The Women's Equity Action League (WEAL), the women's civil rights group that spearheaded the campaign to get the Order enforced with regard to sex discrimination in universities has called for a Congressional investigation of HEW's handling of the sex discrimination investigations on the campus.

Women throughout the academic world are asking for a revision of all policies that affect women in a negative way. For example, even though a nepotism policy may apply to both husbands and wives, the differential impact is clearly on wives, whatever the policy itself may state. And so women have been pressing for the end of these policies. At the University of Arizona, five faculty wives sued the University to end its nepotism rules, which were subsequently dropped.

Numerous studies have clearly documented that women earn less on the campus even when identically qualified. In one study that examined a variety of factors such as number of papers given at professional meetings, honors, publications and the like, a woman's sex, even when identically qualified, cost her on the average about $845 per year. Women are asking for "equity adjustments" on numerous campuses. These raises are exempt from current wage controls. The University of Maryland and the University of Maine, for example, have set aside small funds to raise the salaries of women, and at the University of Wisconsin 600 women recently received such equity adjustments.

Women are asking for comprehensive plans of affirmative action to "remedy the effects of past discrimination." These plans are required by all federal contractors and require the university to do more than merely cease discriminating. He -- and the university employer is almost always a "he" -- he must go out of his way to see that women are treated fairly. It does not mean that unqualified women must be hired, but that the university develop ways to see that women are recruited and considered, and that whatever criteria are used for men be applied equally to women. A roster of academic women is vitally needed, and several of the women's caucuses in the professional disciplines have begun to develop talent banks.

Institutions need to get the word out that they are recruiting for women in earnest. I recently saw one flyer for a junior faculty member at Yale that stated "Women and minorities are welcome to apply." (It would have been even better if it had stated "Women and minorities, including minority women are welcome to apply.")

What women are asking for -- is essentially the jobs that men now hold. They are tired and angry about being the cheap labor force of the academic community, of being the last hired and the first fired. They want to become associate professors, full professors, department chairmen, deans, and yes, even college presidents. Right now the best way for a woman to become a college president is to get herself to a nunnery. Were it not for the Catholic Sisters, the number of women college presidents would be far less than the number of whooping cranes. Perhaps the first affirmative action we should take is to declare women college presidents an endangered species.

Women are asking for nothing less than the full integration of women on the campus. The very essence of American opportunity is education. We cannot afford to waste fully half of our talented resources. We are going to have to have to do far more than merely give lip service to the ideals that we profess. Commitment to change is not enough. We are going to have to change policies at every level of the institution. To begin with, we are going to have to consider any overt discrimination by faculty, administrative officers and anyone else on the campus, as a serious breach of conduct, for not only is it a violation of federal policy but it violates our sense of ethics and fairness.

Everyone knows that the academic's first response to any problem is to appoint a committee. And indeed, that's a good first step. But this committee is going to be somewhat different from most university committees because it will be wholly, or almost wholly, composed of women. This committee is going to need some paid help and some secretarial staffing as well, for it is going to be asked to examine as much of the institution as possible, to discover what it's like to be a woman on the campus, and then to tell it like it is. But appointing such a committee is just a first baby step, and not a solution.

Grievance procedures concerning discrimination are going to have to be developed, for on some campuses, there is no way for a woman to go through university or college channels if she feels she has been discriminated against on the basis of her sex. Numerous women who have been actively fighting sex discrimination have lost their jobs and literally have no means of redress.

Tenure rules can be revised so that women (and men) can obtain tenure even if they work part-time. Already at Harvard, Princeton and Stanford, part-time faculty can ascend the tenure ladder to full professorship, albeit at a slower rate.

Child care centers are going to become a part of the campus, although the need for them should have been obvious long ago to those who held that women were poor risks because of motherhood. These centers should be available to the children of both male and female faculty, staff and students. For those who wonder where the money will come from for these centers, women are quick to point out the lovely golf course, and the expensive athletic facilities that many institutions are able to finance.

Fringe benefits are coming under a good deal of criticism. TIAA and other retirement plans, based on actuarial tables, pay women less (16% less under TIAA), even though the women contribute the same amount as the men they have worked alongside. The rationale is that women live longer. However, the mortality gap between whites and blacks is far greater than that of men and women, yet we would

all be up in arms if insurance companies were to have differential rates based on race rather than sex.

Maternity leave policies are going to have to be revised. On some campuses wives of faculty members can get maternity coverage on their health insurance but women faculty members cannot get the same benefit. In other places women cannot use sick leave for childbirth, nor do they retain their job if they leave, even for a short period for childbirth or childrearing. Women who leave their job or schoolwork for a year or two of childrearing are viewed very differently from the young men who spend two years away because of military service. The length of time that a woman is out because of pregnancy and childbirth when she is unable to work should be a medical decision between the woman and her doctor. When she is out for medical reasons she should be covered by health insurance and sick leave just as every other temporary disability is covered, be it hernias, heart attacks, or prostate glands. If the woman wants extended time off for childrearing, the policy should at least be the same as it is for other personal leaves of absence, such as the leave men take for military service.

Nepotism rules need to be revised. Recently Stanford, Oberlin, and the Universities of Maine, Michigan, and Minnesota have revised or abolished their nepotism rules so that husbands and wives can work in the same department, provided both meet the standards of employment and that neither is involved in making employment decisions about the other.

Part-time work is going to have to be paid at a rate comparable to full-time work, prorated. Fringe benefits for part-timers can be prorated as necessary.

There is every indication that the Congress will extend the Equal Pay Act to cover executives, professionals and administrators, which means that women faculty will be covered by the Act. Equal pay for equal work is going to have to be a reality on our campuses.

We are going to have to hire more than just a few token women here and there. And they are going to end up in positions of power, like the Academic Dean, Vice President, and Presidents of institutions, too. Women will have to be appointed to all kinds of committees including search committees, to academic councils and senates, and to Boards of Trustees, and in more than token numbers. Department heads are going to be held accountable as to whether they have really sought out women or if they have merely checked the usual informal sources of recruitment which typically exclude women.

On some campuses department heads who want to hire white males for the faculty must explain in detail as to what they did to recruit women and minorities, including minority women, and to explain why they were not hired. Highly developed plans to recruit, hire and promote women will have to be developed on every campus that has federal contracts with review mechanisms to implement and evaluate the effectiveness of these plans. Equally important, these affirmative action plans which are sometimes kept secret, must be made public; indeed, women must have the opportunity not only to evaluate these plans but women must be involved in the development of such plans.

Like it or not, we are going to see numerical goals for hiring women. This is required under the Executive Order for federal contractors, along with timetables and plans for the achievement of these goals. Goals are very different from quotas, for quotas are fixed and exclusionary by definition; in contrast goals are flexible and are an attempt to increase the number of a previously excluded group. Under numerical goals, no employer is ever forced to hire an unqualified

person; if the institution honestly seeks to find women and cannot meet its goals, there is no penalty if it has indeed made what is called a "good faith" effort. The goals are merely targets which the employer tries to achieve. They have been upheld by the Supreme Court, and we will see numerical goals for women and minorities, including minority women, on every campus which has government contracts.

Will this make it harder for white males to find jobs? To some degree, yes. For years women have been accused of using their sex to get ahead on the job, but it is men who have used their sex as a way of keeping down the competition of able women. As one woman said, "The time has come when a mediocre woman ought to be able to go as far as a mediocre man." We will be hiring people strictly on the basis of their ability to do the job, and not on the basis of their particular sex.

At the student level, nothing short of open admissions for women in all coeducational institutions can suffice. There is no rationale for admitting students on the basis of their reproductive organs rather than on the basis of their abilities. Essentially many institutions place a ceiling on the number of qualified women students they will admit, while permitting admittance of men with lower qualifications. Girls need higher grades and higher test scores to get into college. Although the percentage of women undergraduates has been increasing since the 1950's so that it is now 41%, it is still less NOW than the percentage of women undergraduates that we had in 1920, when girls were 47% of the undergraduates, or in 1899 when 53% of all undergraduate degrees went to women. About 75-90% (depending on the particular study) of the well-qualified students who do not go on to college are women.

Sometimes, lack of dormitory space is given as the excuse: "We'd like to have more girls but we just don't have the room for them." Yet dormitories, like hotels, apartments and houses are not built any differently for one sex or the other. When Yale converted some of its previously all-male dormitories for women students, it only added new locks and full-length mirrors. Even the presence of urinals in previously all-male dormitories has posed no problems for inventive women students: the urinals make marvelous planters, and the university is spared the expense of removal. Dormitories can easily be changed from one sex to the other by administrative fiat unless one arbitrarily wants to restrict the number of women students. All that is needed is to add the letters W-O in front of the word "Men." Women's groups have noted that some institutions that claim a shortage of dormitory space for women often refuse to let their women students live off-campus, although men students are allowed that privilege. Dormitory space may well have to be reallocated; certainly lack of dormitory space for one sex should cease to be an excuse for keeping women students out of college.

On many campuses, women students are often treated differently, with far more restrictions in terms of hours and the freedom to live off-campus. Gynecological services are not available for women students although urological services are available for male students. Honorary societies are often segregated by sex, with the men's honoraries being far more prestigious than the women's. On at least one campus, the women need to be better qualified for admission to the women's honorary than the men need to be for admission to the men's honorary. Special student rules for one sex will have to be abolished, for if a rule is a good rule, then it should exist for all students, and not just for one sex or the other.

We need to take a good look at our reasons for excluding part-time students at either the undergraduate or graduate levels. These rules work a particular hardship on women students with family responsibilities as well as on less affluent students. There is no indication whatsoever that these students are any less

committed than full time students. Residence requirements which give a limited time toward earning a degree need to be re-examined in light of the impact that this has in discouraging women from attending and completing school. And is there any reason, other than academic tradition, that prevents schools from giving scholarships on a part-time basis? Certainly, financial aid policies will need to be reevaluated, particularly in terms of the large number of scholarships that are restricted to men only.

We also need to encourage women to return to school if they desire to do so. Many of our best students were the World War II veterans who had been out of school for several years. Women who decide to return are similarly well motivated and should not be denied the opportunity to learn. Many schools who welcome retired military officers who return to school to prepare for a second career, discourage women who wish to return for the identical training. Although some schools have small programs for women who wish to return to college, most of these programs are out of the mainstream of campus life, receiving little money and little attention. We do not ask that our Mathematics Departments show a profit but we expect our continuing education programs to be self-supporting. Surely the time has come to accept the notion that students who are neither young, male, nor single have a right to an education.

Examination of the curriculum is essential if women are to overcome the handicaps of sex role stereotypes. About 700 women's studies courses are being taught this year. Anyone who has looked at the extensive reading lists of many of these courses knows that they are not frivolous but highly academic, enriching the perspectives of traditional fields. For many young women (and men, too) these courses serve a very real purpose in helping young women to examine themselves as women for the first time in their lives. By confronting themselves as women, they can begin to deal with the contradictions and conflicts in their lives. For this purpose, the women's studies courses serve a unique role, for unlike many academic courses they are directly relevant to the lives of their students. They are consciousness-raising with intelligence and without hysteria.

Just as blacks have rightfully said that their history has been stolen from them, so it can be said of women and their history. Young men and women need to learn such things as that the cotton gin was not invented by Eli Whitney but by the widow of the Revolutionary War General Nathaniel Greene. She assigned the patent to Whitney because as a good business woman who knew that no one would buy a new machine invented by a "fool woman."

It is also critical that faculty be aware of the role of women within their own academic disciplines. Certainly a history course which deals with civil rights must include the civil rights of women; a psychology course that deals with the socialization of children must discuss how girls are socialized in contrast to boys. Faculty, along with students, have begun to examine textbooks and other academic materials for their handling of women. In one study of 27 leading text-books used in college level American History courses, women were virtually absent; no book devoted more than 2% of its pages to women; one had 5/100 of 1% devoted to women. In many books Harriet Beecher Stowe and Eleanor Roosevelt were not even mentioned. Women have begun to complain to textbook salespeople about such biased books. When salespeople have been unresponsive they have written to the publishers complaining. Pressure on publishers from academicians will be of enormous help in getting changes in the textbooks that influence our young people. The academic women's caucuses have also begun to put pressure on the publishers for this kind of change, and to get out the word as to which books are derogatory to women, and which are not.

A relatively new area of activity is the faculty institute on course content. At Alverno College in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, faculty met for two days in the fall of 1971 to evaluate how they were making their courses specifically relevant to the education of women, and how they could supplement or revise their materials and teaching methods to do so. Other groups have taken surveys at their institutions or within their disciplines to see whether or not women are included in appropriate course content.

Our women students need to know that the world has changed for them, and that the majority of them will work for 25 years or more, whether or not they marry, whether or not they take time out to raise children. They need to know that women who work full time with a bachelor's degree will earn about the same median income as a man who is a high school dropout.

Often it has been said that women can be helped to raise their aspirations by providing them with good counseling. While better counseling would be helpful, it is not likely to help most of our young women change their lives or reevaluate their vocational plans unless something else occurs. Blacks did not need better counseling in order to raise their aspirations; what they needed to have was a keen sense of the discrimination they face, and the knowledge that overcoming the barriers was indeed possible. We must sharpen the discontent of women and we are going to have to teach our young women to struggle against the injustice of discrimination.

The list of women's issues on the campus is lengthy and growing as women examine every facet of university life in its relationship to women. They are asking for change, and change is never easy.

If we are to come to grips with the problems of population control, we must achieve equal opportunity for women. Childbearing and childrearing will continue to consume a smaller proportion of women's lives than previously; at age 35 the youngest child of most women will be in school, and what will women do with the rest of their lives? If the only alternative to extensive childrearing is discrimination in education and in employment then too many women will continue to choose to have too many babies, despite the pill, birth control information and abortion reform.

The hardest thing about the women's movement is that there is no real enemy that one can hate with self-righteous justification. Men are not the enemy, for surely many of them have been hurt, perhaps in different ways, but hurt nevertheless by the same rigid stereotypes that hurt women. Certainly we need compassion for all those, women and men alike, who have been crippled by their experiences in the past. We need compassion for those women who act with an impatience born out of bitterness and despair, for there but for the grace of God go all of us. We need compassion for those women who tell us "there is no discrimination," and who cannot yet help their sisters. And we even need compassion for those men who tell us that their wives are "perfectly happy." We will even have to have compassion as male backlash increases. For surely as women make gains, there will indeed be more resistance to it.

Yet for all of us, what will be hardest to change is our own attitudes and assumptions about what women want, what women are really like, what women need. We -- women and men both -- are going to have to work with women in ways in which we perhaps have never done before, in full partnership. Our society is such that we have all been trained so that women and men can only relate to each other as marriage partners, as lovers, or in an up-down relationship, like that of the male boss and the female assistant. Yet the lives of women and men are joined

together, inextricably. We cannot escape each other, nor do we wish to do so. We are wife and husband, mother and son, father and daughter. The women's movement is not going to go away; it is not a passing fad or flash in the pan, because too many women care, and so many men care, too.

Society changes slowly. All of us, women and men, will need to help each other as we grope together to work out the problems that arise as women's traditional roles shift towards greater equality of opportunity. It will not be easy. No longer will women weep when discrimination hurts. No longer will women grow bitter when denied the opportunities that are the birthright of their brothers. For women have something else to do. They have learned that the hand that rocks the cradle can indeed rock the boat.